REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-6 remain in the application. Claim 1 has been amended.

In item 1 on pages 2-3 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 1, 3-4, and 6 have been rejected as being anticipated by Reddersen et al. (US 5,703,347) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references. However, the language of claim 1 has been slightly modified in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. Support for the changes is found on page 5, line 20 of the specification.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, inter alia:

> a control system configured to control a printing machine, said control system including a central computer and a plurality of neutral participants, said

participants interacting with said central computer in order to carry out processes;

a bus system including lines, said participants being connected to one another via said lines of said bus system;

said lines of said bus system and said participants having respective plugs connecting said lines to said participants; and

at least given ones said plugs of said lines of said bus system having reserved plug contacts, said reserved plug contacts being provided with at least one galvanic link.

The invention of the instant application relates to clearly defining subscribers to a bus system without the risk of their being confused with one another. To this end, a precautionary measure, which defines the corresponding slot, is taken in the bus system's line set. The bus subscriber can therefore remain neutral and is assigned a task through the slot it occupies with the aid of the measures taken in the line set. In other words, the exchange of two subscribers, which fulfill different tasks, does not lead to any change or any harm. This advantage comes into play in the service context in that it is not necessary to have a separate bus subscriber available as a replacement for every function. Furthermore, the bus subscriber does not have to be readied for its job by the service man; rather it receives its assignment through the slot. The advantages include the impossibility of confusion and the ease of handling.

The concept of the invention of the instant application is that one computer system (host) with neutral bus subscribers can carry out different tasks. The task for the neutral subscribers is defined by the measures taken in the bus system's line set.

According to Reddersen et al., bus subscribers (data readers) can be connected to various computer systems over different cables. The concept of Reddersen et al. is apparently for a manufacturer of bus subscribers (data readers) to be able to connect them to different computer systems (hosts) using different cables.

Claim 1 of Reddersen et al. describes the capability of "assembling the data reading system by selecting a corresponding interconnect cable" through which several computer systems can be connected by replacing the cable.

Claim 10 of Reddersen et al. describes the function of the label on the interconnect cable.

Claim 18 of Reddersen et al. describes a "multiple interface data reading system."

Claim 22 of Reddersen et al. describes a "cable being changeable."

Claim 28 of Reddersen et al. describes the feature " identifying the given host/application for which the data reader will be used."

All these features suggest that the device/method proposed by Reddersen et al. has a concept different from that of the invention of the instant application. Reddersen et al. also do not contain any suggestion that the connection between a host and a subscriber is designed as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

Claim 1 of the instant application is, therefore, believed to be patentable over Reddersen et al. and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-6 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of one month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of $120.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Yonghong Chen
Reg. No. 56,150

/Yonghong Chen/
For Applicants

YC

January 20, 2006

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101